

Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership filed an application with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) for a pipeline routing permit for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project on April 24, 2015. The application includes a preferred route. The project will replace an existing pipeline that enters Minnesota in Kittson County, connects with other pipelines at the Clearbrook terminal and terminates in Superior, Wisconsin.

Pipelines requiring a route permit can only be built on the route designated by the Commission, and a route can only be selected if it is considered at a public hearing. The preferred route is automatically accepted; however, an alternative can only be considered at the hearing if it is accepted by the Commission before the hearing is publicized. This insures the public is informed of all proposed route alternatives under consideration prior to the start of the hearing process.

Any person (meaning any individual, organization, government agency, and so on) can suggest an alternative route or route segment. An alternative route or route segment is a location other than the one proposed by the applicant; it must accomplish the project's stated need and purpose. In this instance, an *alternative route* would completely replace the applicant's preferred route, but must include the identified end points — enter Minnesota in Kittson County and terminate in Superior — and connect with the terminal in Clearbrook. An *alternative route segment* would leave the preferred route to avoid a specific impact and then return to it — substituting for only a portion of the preferred route.

Tips for Suggesting an Alternative

Information is provided on the back side of this sheet to help you propose an alternative route or route segment. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact the Environmental Review Manager. Suggestions must meet the requirements found in Minnesota Rule 7852.1400, must be received by **September 30, 2015**, and specifically identify the project.

The Life of Your Alternative: Step-by-Step

1. An applicant applies for a routing permit to construct a pipeline. This application includes a preferred route.
2. You suggest an alternative to all or a segment of the preferred route providing the required information within the appropriate timeframe.
3. The Commission determines if your alternative will be considered at the hearing.
4. The environmental impacts of your alternative — as well as the preferred route and other suggested alternatives — are analyzed and made publicly available prior to the hearing.
5. You are expected to present your alternative at the hearing supporting your alternative.
6. The public, including the applicant, has the opportunity to comment on all alternatives.
7. An Administrative Law Judge prepares a report that includes recommendation on alternative routes.
8. If the routing permit is approved, the Commission's permit decision might include your suggested alternative.
9. If your alternative is included, the pipeline must be constructed in that location.

1. Provide a Map

Providing a map is not only helpful to highlight an anticipated impact or mark a suggested alternative — it is required (Minn. R. 7852.1400, subp. 3(A)). To be useful maps must be of proper scale. At the wrong scale, a map will not provide enough detail to assist in pinpointing an impact or alternative. For example, the line created by a felt tip marker on a state highway map can cover entire cities and highways.

Use a county, township or city map depending on your alternative. You can also use free online mapping resources such as Google Maps, Google Earth, or similar websites. These maps can be zoomed and printed to provide appropriate levels of detail. If you are having trouble locating a map at the proper scale, contact the Environmental Review Manager.

2. Suggest an Alternative Route or Route Segment

Explain the reasons for suggesting an alternative. You do not need to provide the same level of detail or analysis in your explanation(s) as the applicant provided; however, your explanation(s) must be able to stand independently so others do not need to “fill in the blanks” to understand it.

Your alternative must be accompanied by a description of the environmental conditions along it, and its anticipated environmental and human impact (Minn. R. 7852.1400, subp. 3(B)). Do your best. Your explanation must discuss: 1) an anticipated impact created by the preferred route; 2) your alternative route or route segment and its impacts; and 3) how your alternative route or route segment mitigates the anticipated impact you identified.

These individual parts, taken as a whole, generally provide the information needed to fully understand your suggestion, determine if the alternative meets the required criteria, and, ultimately, if it will be accepted by the Commission for inclusion in the public hearing. If more information is needed, you will be requested to provide that information and will have 10 days to respond that request (Minn. R. 7852.1400, subp. 4).

Remember, if accepted, you are expected to present support for your alternative at a public hearing (Minn. R. 7852.1400, subp. 1).

3. Submit the Suggestion on Time

Alternatives must be post-marked or received electronically by **September 30, 2015** (Minn. R. 7852.1400, subp. 3(C)).

For help submitting an alternative route or route segment, or to ask questions, don't hesitate to contact the EERA Environmental Review Manager. This is the staff person most familiar with a project.

Jamie MacAlister, Environmental Review Manager
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
Saint Paul, MN 55101-2198

(651) 539-1775
jamie.macalister@state.mn.us